DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 447 SP 033 351

AUTHOR Ganser, Tom
TITLE Matching Beginning Teachers and Mentors: Perceptions of Participants in a State-Mandated Mentoring Program.
PUB DATE 19 Apr 91
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Mentoring Association (4th, Chicago, IL, April 19, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teacher Induction; Collegiality; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; Interviews; *Mentors; *Peer Relationship; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; School Personnel; *State Programs; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Improvement; Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS *Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

A Wisconsin study examined the perceptions of participants in a state-mandated mentoring program for beginning teachers. A researcher obtained names and addresses of beginning teachers, counselors, and librarians as well as personnel serving as mentors to beginners. A total of 14 mentors and 15 beginning teachers, counselors, and librarians agreed to participate. During May and June of 1991, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with each of the participants. The interview asked about five topics: (1) the mentor's prior experience in mentoring or the beginning teacher's preparation program and work schedule; (2) effective mentoring programs in general; (3) specific features of mentoring programs; (4) factors used in matching beginners and mentors; and (5) perceived benefits and problems of mentoring programs. Most of the participants stressed how greatly they valued effective mentoring programs for beginning teachers, school librarians, and school counselors. They perceived that the greatest obstacles to effective mentoring programs lay within the structure and organization of the school, especially in terms of how easily beginners and mentors could spend time together. Most participants considered a formal mentoring program a relatively new idea. They strongly believed that a successful match between mentor and beginner was related to their work assignment and the opportunity for them to spend time togehter. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED337447

Matching Beginning Teachers and Mentors: Perceptions of Participants in a State-Mandated Mentoring Program

(Draft)

Tom Ganser

Director
Beginning Teacher Assistance Program
University of Wisconsin--Whitewater

April 19, 1991

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T Ganser

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This paper was prepared for presentation at the **Diversity in Mentoring** conference (Fourth Annual Conference of the Mentoring Association), in Chicago, Illinois, on April 19, 1991.

Support for the research upon which this paper is based was provided through a Summer Faculty Fellowship Award (Southwest Missouri State University) and a State Research Grant (University of Wisconsin--Whitewater).

Criticisms and reactions to this paper are invited. Please contact the author at:

Tom Ganser, Ph. D.
Associate Director of Clinical Experiences
University of Wisconsin--Whitewater
2042 Winther Hall
Whitewater, Wisconsin 53190-1790
Telephone: (414) 472-1895
FAX: (414) 472-5716
Internet: GanserT@UWWVAX.UWW.EDU

SP033351

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Background

Assistance Programs for Beginning Teachers

Since the early 1970s, attention paid to programs for beginning teachers has grown from tokenism to the wide-spread implementation of programs, often in response to state mandates. Major reports for the reform of teacher education and the professionalization of teaching call for assisting beginning teachers (e.g., National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, 1985; Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; The Holmes Group, 1986; Sikula, 1986).

The central feature of most programs for beginning teachers is a mentoring program which pairs a beginning teacher with an experienced teacher referred to as a mentor, support teacher, coach, buddy teacher, etc. While this mentoring relationship may take different forms (Howey & Zimpher, 1988), recommendations for selecting and matching mentors and beginning teachers reveal many common factors, including age, gender, type of work assignment, physical location in a school building, and shared teaching styles and ideologies. Basic elements of mentoring programs, including mentor selection, mentor roles, incentives, and benefits of mentoring programs, are described in Bey and Holmes (1990) and Huling-Austin (1990).

Background to this Study

In the mid-1980s the state legislation of a centrally located state passed a comprehensive educational reform act. (Note: In order to protect their identity, the participants in this report are referred to only by number, and the information provided about them and their school districts is presented in generalized format.) One provision of this act required all school districts to establish a mentoring program and to pair beginning teachers, school counselors, and school librarians with a mentor during their first year of work. "Beginning" is defined to include experienced teachers, counselors, and librarians who are new to a district or who are re-entering the workplace after several years' absence, in addition to those who are starting their first job as a teacher, counselor, or librarian. Furthermore, qualification for a license beyond the initial license requires verification of participation in a mentoring program.

Although the reform act orders each school district to establish a mentoring program for beginning employees, little funding is provided to districts to cover associated costs, nor is much direction given to districts in formulating program goals, design, implementation, or evaluation. The reform act called for school districts to pilot a mentoring program during 1988-1989 and to have a program in place by the beginning of the 1989-1990 school year.

Participants and Study Design

Participants

I obtained names and addresses of 71 beginning teachers, counselors, and librarians, and 61 employees serving as mentors to beginners, from three school districts in the state. Each of these persons participated in a mentoring program during 1989-1990. Harrison School District is an urban district, Pierce School District is a suburban district, and Fillmore is a rural district. Selected characteristics of these districts is provided in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

In response to a letter of inquiry sent to each of the mentors or beginners in early May, 14 mentors and 15 beginners agreed to be interviewed. Details about the response rate of potential participants are provided in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

The participants in this study include 13 mentor teachers and one mentor school counselor, and 13 beginning teachers and two beginning librarians. They are predominantly female and white, although they differ considerable in age, teaching experience, and school level. Additional characteristics of the participants are provided in Tables 3, 4, and 5.

Insert Table 3 about here

Insert Table 4 about here

Insert Table 5 about here

Data Collection

During May and June, 1990, I interviewed each of the 29 people who agreed to participate in this study one time. Twenty-six interviews were tape-recorded. These interviews ranged from 16 to 51 minutes in length, and averaged 29 minutes for both the beginners and the mentors. Three participants (two mentors and one beginner) preferred that I not tape-record their interviews, and so I took notes during these interviews which I later

expanded orally using a tape-recorder. Verbatim transcriptions of the 29 tape-recordings totalling 455 pages (at 55 40-character lines per page) were prepared.

The interviews were semi-structured. The schedule included questions related to (1) the mentor's prior experience in formal and informal mentoring situations or the beginner's teacher preparation program and work schedule, (2) effective mentoring programs in general, (3) specific features of mentoring programs (evaluation of beginners by mentors, training of mentors, incentive and rewards for mentors, specification of responsibilities, support of administration, sharing of preparation and lunch periods by beginners and mentors, physical proximity of beginners and mentors, and individualization of mentoring programs, (4) factors used in matching beginners and mentors (age, gender, content area or grade, and general approach to teaching), and (5) perceived benefits and problems of mentoring programs.

Data Analysis

The verbatim transcriptions of the interviews were read four times for emergent categories of information, following procedures described by Lofland and Lofland (1984) and Lincoln and Guba (1985). Preliminary categories were expanded or collapsed, and criteria for inclusion of data in categories were established. This process resulted in seven major categories, each of which contained two or more sub-categories (mentor characteristics [2 sub-categories], mentor roles [9], matching factors [6], features of formal mentoring programs [7], benefits of mentor programs [9], and potential problems of mentor programs [3]. I used The Ethnograph (Seidel, Kjolseth, & Seymour, 1988), a computer program, to facilitate the mechanical process of coding transcriptions, and the sorting and retrieval of coded segments.

Key Elements of Selecting Mentors and Pairing Them with Beginning Teachers

During the interviews, I asked the participants to share their thoughts on critical elements of mentoring programs in two ways. First, I asked them to describe features of an effective mentoring program. Second, I presented them with several factors associated with mentoring programs for their reactions. The process of selecting mentors and of pairing them with beginners figured significantly in both portions of the interview.

Participants had much to say about what contributes to an effective mentoring relationship, especially in terms of the characteristics of experienced teachers which are related to the likelihood that they will be good mentors. There are seven characteristics that reflect most of the participants' observations on mentor selection. They are:

1. Gender
2. Age
3. Work experience

4. Philosophy of or approach to teaching
5. Personality
6. Grade level or content area
7. Accessibility.

The participants generally attributed relatively little importance to gender, age, and philosophy of teaching in selecting mentors and pairing them with beginners. They generally believed that the other four (and especially grade level or content area, and accessibility) are much more critical.

Gender

Participants generally viewed matching beginners and mentors according to gender as insignificant. M-13, for example, directly states that "Gender is not a factor," and B-12 believes that "It doesn't matter." Participants saw other factors as being much more important. "I don't think that [differences in gender] makes any difference as long as they had that experience and can answer my questions and help me," observes B-10. Similarly, B-02 believes that feeling "comfortable" in a mentoring relationship depends more on compatible personalities than on their being the same sex.

Some participants (B-03, M-04, and M-11) feel that beginners and mentors might feel more comfortable with one another if they are the same sex. As B-03, notes, "I have a male mentor and he's friendly, but it's just not the same." B-13 is more explicit about this, as evident in her remark that "I think I probably . . . was definitely more comfortable having a mentor of the same gender." M-10 (a male) believes that arranging for beginner and mentor to be the same sex is a major factor only in a "sexually oriented activity or program" such as Health or Physical Education.

Interestingly, B-07 believes that a negative outcome of pairing up beginners with mentors according to gender may be "competition between the same sex". In regard to this issue, B-09 shares her own experience:

> Often I like working with men better [than working with women]. . . . I think sometimes women can be much more intimidating to new women coming in, and I think men are just, 'Hey, you know, this is what this is all about,' and they're more open and receptive and less critical and they judge less. I would love to have a male mentor. I really would.

In addition, M-02 asserts that making efforts to match beginners and mentors according to sex is sexist in its own right. "I would tend to disagree that you have to have a mentor of the same sex," M-02 comments, adding, "I think that's a terribly sexist attitude." On a related issue, M-11 and B-08 caution that a potential problem may occur when beginner and mentor are different sexes if one is married and one is unmarried, especially if mentoring-related activities are carried on "after hours" (B-08).

Participants are quick to point out that matching beginners and mentors according to gender is a moot point, given school

staffing patterns, especially in the case of elementary schools. B-04 observes, "In an elementary school I don't know how you're going to get around that [i.e., pairing a beginning male teacher with a female mentor]. We have no male teachers at all in our building." In high schools, limited flexibility to pair beginners and mentors according to gender is sometimes related to patterns in academic departments. B-11 refers to the science department in her school as she says, "I don't know that you could really stick by it [pairing mentors and beginners by gender] because in many departments . . . the science teachers are all men, and you get one lady, you know, that isn't."

Age

As in the case of gender, the participants ascribe relatively little importance to a certain age difference between mentor and beginner (e.g., mentors being 8 to 15 years older than beginners). The issue of age is more confusing, however, inasmuch as it is related to work experience.

Some participants suggest that age is not an important consideration in pairing beginners and mentors. For example, M-13 says that "Age is not a factor. As far as from my experience, age has not been a factor," and M-08 says, "Age-wise, I don't know that that matters that much." Similarly, B-08 and B-02 de-emphasize the importance of selecting mentors who are 8 to 15 years older than the beginners with whom they work. "I don't think it's a necessary component," observes B-08, adding that her mentor "was quite a bit older than I am, but I don't think [that] had any [negative] effect."

However, some participants do view difference in age as important. While admitting that an older prospective mentor has more energy than she does, M-03 nevertheless points out that "we're going to give him [a beginning teacher] a noticeably older woman," thereby implying that a large difference in age between the mentor and the beginner is noteworthy. (In contrast to this, M-05 comments that she has become "very fast friends" with a beginner 25 years her junior.) B-05 believes that a difference in age of 8 to 15 years "would help." M-09, looking to her own experience, says, "It just so happens I am about that much older [about 15 years] than the young girl that I was working with and I agree with all of that [regarding the recommended age difference]. I really do."

M-04 and M-12 believe that mentors who are considerably older than beginners may be preferable to younger mentors. Reflecting on the beginner with whom she worked, M-12 notes, "She might've related better to someone younger, but, you know, those of us with experience sometimes have . . . maybe some wisdom that others don't have." M-04 extends the advantage of a beginner working with an older mentor beyond teaching to the beginner's personal life. She says:

> I think that would be a good idea, especially the age difference, because I think it works more than just at the school level, because there's a problem of all of the sudden this [beginning] teacher now has the responsibility of her

> class [but also] she has her own home life problems and we have talked about things outside of school. It's a life that's different than it was when she was a college student or a student teacher.

Some participants view a mentor who is younger than a beginner as a problem. For instance, B-12 and B-08 indicate that they would have felt differently about their mentoring experiences had their mentor been younger than themselves. B-12 comments:

> I'm 28. I wouldn't feel the same if my mentor was a 24-year-old. My mentor was in her fifties and I respected her and she's had twenty-some years under her belt. I think it's nice to have a mentor who's a little bit older than you are.

B-08 is even more definite about this issue. She says, "I would not work well with a mentor teacher who was younger than I was." B-01 and M-07 also indicate some concerns in this regard. B-01 says:

> I mean, probably if you had someone who was, I don't know, maybe a thirty-year-old teacher who had been teaching for nine years and a forty-year-old first-year teacher, that might not be a good match, but I don't know. I guess it would depend on that first-year teacher. How will would they be to take comments from someone who was ten years younger than they were?

M-07 makes a similar observation:

> I could see a problem if I were the 5th-grade teacher's age, and I was being mentored by the one that was twenty years younger than her, in that sense, reversing it the other direction, you know. I would definitely not go that way, if at all possible.

Several participants observe that "beginning" teachers may often be younger than prospective mentors because of non-traditional career paths. As B-09 points out, "I think a good mentor could be younger than the re-entering teacher." M-05 comments, "I have been assigned as a mentor to people . . . Well, one of mine this year is two years older than I am. But she went back to school late and she just now got her degree." B-13, herself a non-traditional student, observes, "Age is not something that I find as critical as most people [do], because I'm one of the older beginning teachers. My mentor was 7 or 8 years younger than I was. I had no problems with that."

Experience

Age as a factor to be taken into account in selecting mentors and pairing them with beginners is related to teaching experience, with experience being the far more important variable. As B-10 says,

> I don't think that age would have anything to do with it. I think it's experience. I could care less if this [mentor] teacher was 35 or 58, you know. As long as they had the knowledge that I needed, that's what I care about. I don't care how old they are.

Yet, participants often suggest that selecting mentors on the basis of work experience is not a simple matter. For example, B-11 effectively points to the relative advantages of less experienced and more experienced mentors:

> That one's kind of tough [deciding desirable experience of mentors]. I don't know. 'Cause I think sometimes you can see a positive and a negative, either way. I don't think you could make a blanket rule on something like that. I know, as a benefit, if you had a teacher that had only been teaching for three or four years, they're still going to really remember some of those concerns that they had. But at the same time, a guy that's taught for 25 years, really knows some different ways, some different problems.

In general, participants concur that prospective mentors need to have some experience in order to be, as M-01 suggests, "reasonably familiar with the system." Likewise, B-09 believes that mentors must "have been in that district and know the ins and outs of the district and their school." While believing that age itself is unimportant, M-10 believes that a mentor needs at least five years of experience: "You should have been over the road a little," he observes. From a very practical perspective, B-06 argues that mentors need to have enough experience so that they have the time to be a mentor. "I think three or so years of teaching under your belt is important," she observes, "So that they have the job down well enough that they've got the time to do these extra things [related to mentoring]."

Participants recommend that prospective mentors have from only two to as many as ten years of experience. Advocating relatively few years of teaching experience, B-10 says, "I think even two years would be sufficient. By two years, if you don't know your school, then there's something wrong. I feel like I know my school after one year." On the other hand, B-05 argues for more experience:

> Maybe about ten years difference might be all right because then you have the respect for that person's experience. If it's like two or three years, they may think, "She or he taught two, three years [so] how do they know better?"

Interestingly, many participants favor mentors with relatively little experience so that they more readily can recall their own induction into teaching and therefore empathize better with beginners. B-02 voices this sentiment:

> One thing I thought that might be important is . . . if they're assisting a brand new teacher coming in, sometimes when you have been teaching yourself for five years, it's real hard to go back and think . . . you know, even Mrs. Johnson forgot that I knew nothing about fire drill procedures. They're so automatic now [for her] and you don't even think about them. So it might not be a bad idea if instead of having like three to five years [of experience], if it'd maybe only be two years. So that the person is not so far removed from being a fresh teacher themselves and can still empathize and know, "Well, gee, I

had trouble finding the bathroom for the boys, you know, up on the second floor." 'Cause you forget the basic things that you don't remember.

M-02, a mentor with few years of experience, makes a similar comment:

One of the things that I think has helped me with Annette is I know exactly what Annette's going through. I haven't forgotten. . . . I mean, I remember very well what it was like, and ten years down the road I probably won't remember it so well. . . . When I forget what it's like to come in here and be handed your text books right before school starts and your major instructional goals and your list of this, that, and everything else that you have to do, plus sponsor something. I know it's going to be a problem when I forget that because I'm not going to have the kind of empathy and sympathy for what these new teachers are going through.

Philosophy/approach

As a group, participants express a wide range of opinion regarding efforts to match beginners and mentors according to shared or at least compatible teaching philosophies and approaches to teaching. B-06 believes that it is not important at all that mentor and beginner share similar philosophies of teaching. More typically, participants suggest that similar philosophies is of some importance at least. For instance, M-04 notes, "I think it's important but I wouldn't put it at the top of the list," and B-15 expresses a preference for "being matched up with a mentor that would be compatible, philosophically, with me." On the other hand, M-14 describes a shared philosophy of teaching as "very important." In describing herself as a "real direct, straight forward teacher . . . a real structured teacher," M-05 suggests that her being paired with a more reserved teacher might be problematic. As a school counselor, M-06 believes that matching beginning counselors and mentors should also take into account the similarity of their counseling approach.

Among the participants who value matching beginners and mentors according to shared ideas about teaching, learning, children, etc., the typical reason cited is that such compatibility allows beginners and mentors to get along with one another more easily. As M-09 says, mentoring is simply "a lot easier. It is a lot easier," when beginner and mentor think alike in terms of teaching. "If the beginner and the mentor are totally different teachers," notes B-07, "it's harder [than] if they're the same. . . . If he [mentor] teaches differently he can't give you [beginner] a way [to solve a problem] that you will feel comfortable with." B-04 also points out that mentors who have been out of college for several years may feel threatened by beginners whose ideas about instruction reflect more recent preparation. She comments: "Teachers who came out of college maybe even ten years ago and are more traditional-type teachers are very threatened by the new ways."

On the negative side, many participants also observe that similarity in teaching philosophy may also limit the opportunities for professional growth, for both the beginner and the mentor. For example, B-09 says:

> If you're going to grow as a teacher I think you need to be open to new ideas, and if you have really the same philosophies, I don't know. . . . If you're identical in your philosophies and classroom management, sure, you're both going to feel good about the relationship, but how much is this new teacher going to grow and be exposed to something different?

Professional development can only occur, many participants believe, when beginner and mentor hold different views about teaching. B-14 suggests that "you can get good ideas from somebody that has entirely different [ideas] from yours." M-12 reduces the desirable difference in thinking between beginning and mentor a bit, and says, "As a matter of fact, I think it might be beneficial to have a nice blend of two different philosophies."

Putting aside the value of matching beginners and mentors according to similar philosophies about teaching, several participants pointed out practical problems in this regard. Some note the problem of being <u>unable</u> to determine the teaching philosophy of a beginning teacher in order to match him or her with a mentor with a compatible philosophy. B-07 mentions that often relatively little time is spent in the interviewing process for hiring a new teacher, and so little information is available about a beginner's beliefs about teaching. M-07 and M-13 suggest that getting to know a beginner's philosophy can only happen on the job and with the passage of time. M-07 comments:

> I don't know how someone would know that [i.e., a beginner's philosophy of teaching] ahead of time. The teacher that has been there [i.e., mentor], surely the principal or somebody would kind of know their approach, but a new person coming in, I don't know how you'd be able to gauge what they were working on to be able to do that.

Similarly, M-13 says, "You wouldn't be able to do it [determine the beginner's approach] until this beginning teacher has more or less gotten in there and started."

In addition, some beginners believe that beginning teachers often do not know what their philosophy of teaching is (e.g., B-06). M-03 also emphasizes the danger of trying to force a beginner to specify his or her philosophy of teaching. She says:

> I don't think these kids coming out of college know what their philosophy of teaching is. I don't think you could use that as any kind of match up because I think they would just try to regurgitate some gobbledygoop out of something they read somewhere that sounded good. . . . I really don't think they know what their philosophy of teaching is. I don't think they know priorities until they're there.

Admitting that her philosophy of teaching had changed considerably by the end of her first year, B-03 says that she

"probably would just despise the person by the end of the year" who would have been a "match" at the beginning of the year.

Personality

In general, the participants placed far more emphasis on a "personality" match between beginners and mentors than they did on a match in terms of teaching approach. M-06, for example, notes that "probably matching up personalities so that the two people can work well together I just think is REAL important within the [mentoring] program," and B-05 says the success of mentoring "all depends on personality." The participants often describe the goal of matching beginners and mentors as making sure they feel "comfortable" with one another. M-10 describes a "kind of mutual agreement among mentor teachers and beginning teachers that they feel comfortable with one another," and B-02 believes that a very important part of matching mentors with beginners is "to make sure that the personalities mesh. That they're going to be comfortable with one another, 'cause that can be [a] real important thing." Some participants, however, take exception to this need for personality match. "I don't think you have to be best of friends," notes B-09, "but on a professional level I think that it's valuable to have two people that could work together, even though you're not really working together." M-08 admits that she and her beginner were very different in terms of personality. She says, "Personality-wise we are COMPLETELY different. Teaching style, COMPLETELY different. . . . Our personalities were completely different, but yet I think we got along. I don't know why."

Often, "attitude" is described as the most important element of personality match in the mentoring relationship. In describing critical features used in matching beginners and mentors, M-01 says, "I think it's attitude more than anything else, you know, whether you feel like you're going to be helping someone and if the person is receptive to the helping." B-13 believes that good mentors have "a willingness and an interest and an ability to share themselves," which she describes as a natural instinct in the same way that "some people are naturally good mothers." Several mentors suggest that their motivation for working with beginning teachers is similar to their reasons for working with student teachers. For example, M-08 believes that volunteering to work with a beginning teacher "is a lot like taking a student teacher. I mean, you have to be a certain kind of person." M-01 voices a similar sentiment when she says,

> If I were asked to be a mentor teacher I wouldn't do it because there was going to be any reward. I would do it because I like working with beginning teachers. I like working with student teachers. That to me is exciting.

M-03 even suggests that some prospective mentors, even though successful teachers, may not make good mentors because they do not want to share their work practices with others. She says, "Let's be honest. There are some successful teachers that [think], 'I'm going to be successful and you're not because I have these wonderful secrets I'm never gonna tell.'"

Another "personality" characteristic of prospective mentors to which very many of the participants--and especially the beginners--refer is the ability of mentors to empathize with the beginner's experiences. B-05 stresses that "the old school teacher has to go back and feel how a new teacher feels." Likewise, B-04 thinks that it is hard for "a person who's been teaching a number of years . . . to get down on the level of a new teacher." Analogous thinking emerges with respect to the routine procedures that may baffle a beginner. B-11 believes that mentors may therefore need "some sort of guidebook to help the other teacher [mentor] telling you [the beginner] because so much of that is rote. You know, they just learned it and now they know it and they're not going to know what you don't know."

When asked to describe the potential problems of mentoring, both mentors and beginners very often cite "personality conflicts" as the most likely problem. M-06 notes, "Unless you had a personality conflict, I can't imagine that you would have a great deal of problems." Describing potential mentoring problems, B-05 says, "Personality conflicts. Just like husband and wife. . . . I think that would be the biggest problem. Not the theories or anything but somehow personality." Finally, B-08 suggests that the possibility of significant personality conflicts requires the need for a way to end mentoring relationships gracefully:

> Even with all the other things in place, you may find, two or three weeks into it, that there's just something about that person [so] that you can't work with [him or her]. It doesn't mean there's anything wrong with them. If just means you've got something not working and there needs to be a way to be able to bow out gracefully."

Grade Level or Content Area

In general, the most frequently cited factor associated by the participants with an effective mentoring program is the matching of beginners and mentors by grade level or content area. Referring to her own experiences, M-08 says, "There would not have been any way she [M-08's beginner] would have listened to any suggestions I made if we were not teaching the same grade level. I really believe that." M-12 says that there are serious problems if the mentor does not have experience teaching at the beginner's grade level. She says, "I would not offer, and I hope [I] would not be asked to mentor someone who was going to be a 6th grade teacher, because I've never taught 6th grade." The participants who are beginners also feel that very similar work assignments are essential if the mentor is to be of benefit to the beginner. B-06 suggests that a difference of only two grades may be a significant obstacle: "Teaching the same grade, I think, is very important. In fact, I taught 4th [grade], and this lady [B-06's mentor] taught 6th grade, and we just didn't share that much." Similarly, B-09 doubts that a kindergarten teacher would even be able to recognize the needs of a 5th or 6th grade teacher.

Other participants believe that it is less important that a

beginner and mentor teach the same grade. M-11, for instance, believes the match should be between beginners and mentors who teach lower elementary grades (1-3) or upper elementary grades (4-6), but that "it was less important that they were both exactly the same grade." Similarly, M-01 believes that a mentor needs to be "reasonably familiar with either the subject area or the grade level [emphasis added]" of the beginner, and B-12 suggests that "It's always nice to have another teacher or mentor on that [beginner's] grade level so that you can talk about textbook things and talk about student ability at that level. It all helps [emphasis added]." M-14 argues that mentors, ideally, should be able to teach well at several different grade levels: "Hopefully a person who is a mentor is a person who would be able to be a good teacher [and who could] go in and teach any grade. They may have preferences but they could be a good teacher at any grade level."

The participants working in high schools are especially vocal in suggesting that mentors must have experiences that relate directly to their beginners' work assignment. B-07 feels that it is "essential" that a mentor for a beginning music teacher is also a music teacher. As a Vocational Agriculture teacher, M-10 believes there are very few people for whom he can fit as a good mentor simply because there are not many teachers in that area. B-10, a Vocational Home Economics teacher whose mentor does not teach in the same content area, feels it would have been more beneficial for her to have worked with a mentor in her same area, even if that mentor taught in a different school district. In addition, B-10 and B-11 (who also is a Vocational Home Economics teacher) refer to state and federal funding and grant procedures as a uniquely important reason for pairing beginners in vocational areas with mentors who are also vocational instructors. For example, B-11 says:

> I don't know about other areas, but as far as Vocational Home Ec, my gosh, you've got to have somebody that knows what else goes on, because we meet different guidelines than the average teacher in the building. There're reports that we have to fill out and send across town. . . . We have to meet State Department guidelines that the English, Math, Science [teachers] don't have to worry about.

M-02 and B-03 believe that successful mentoring for beginning high school teachers not only requires that mentors teach in the same content area as the beginners, but that they also teach the same specific courses. B-03 says, "I think they [mentor and beginner] should teach the same subject. My mentor had never taught English I or II. He didn't know what it was like to be in a classroom with freshmen." She goes on to say that without knowledge of the specific courses she was teaching, there was nothing that her mentor could do to assist her.

The two beginning librarians and the counselor mentor express other reasons for matching beginners with mentors in their same field. B-13, a beginning elementary school librarian who is paired up with someone familiar with library work but not

with a classroom teacher, says that if her only mentor had been a classroom teacher, "That would not have benefitted me at all. In fact, it would have been a great handicap." In addition, B-13 and B-02 (who is also a beginning elementary school librarian) suggest that beginning librarians require two mentors, one mentor an experienced librarian and the other should be a classroom teacher. Finally, M-06, an elementary school counselor, believes that beginning counselors who work in multiple schools (different from the schools in which their mentors work) should at least be paired up with mentor counselors who work in schools that are similar in socio-economic status.

Matching Beginning Teachers and Mentors According to Accessibility

Time.

Among the participants, effectiveness of mentoring is consistently linked to the mentor's accessibility in terms time and proximity. There is more agreement on the need for mentors and beginners to spend time together than on any other feature of mentoring programs. The only instance of a participant not ranking shared time as an important factor is B-06, a re-entering teacher, who says, "In my case, I wouldn't feel a need to do that [spend her conference hour and/or lunch period with her mentor]." But she also adds, "For a beginning teacher, I mean, a newly beginning teacher, that would probably be very helpful." However, in general, most participants--mentors and beginners alike--view time spent between mentor and beginner as very important. For example, M-13 says:

> I'd say [the] number one [feature of an effective mentoring program is] release time from my class, to spend with this other teacher. Because in my opinion the number one priority of this job is availability, and I like to make myself available on the casual, spur of the moment instances. Because in your work, you don't always know ahead when you're going to need to ask a question.

M-06 suggests another important element of shared time: regularity. She calls for "a designated time where [sic] the mentor and the person that they are being a mentor for could get together on a designated regular basis and [be] given time to do that [emphasis added]." M-11 also calls for "blocks of time," 50 or 60 minutes in length, that the mentor and beginner can spend together, rather than just a few minutes here and there.

Participants who are beginners make similar observations. "I think it would be terribly frustrating in a high school where you never could see the person," comments B-01. B-08 says:

> I don't think you could have an effective mentorship program if you didn't have proximity and free time, those release times at the same time, because odds are both of you have a family. You know, a first year teacher's going to be working 'til midnight anyway. She doesn't have time to take after-hour hours to do that [meet with her mentor].

B-15, who regrets not having had "a regular time period set aside weekly for meeting with my mentor," suggests that inability to

spend time with a mentor may be even more difficult for beginners who enjoyed a good student teaching experience. She comments:

> I had come from a student teaching situation where I was having a lot of daily contact with my supervising teacher, and to go from one extreme to the other is fairly drastic. Not that I couldn't handle it, but I felt like I was probably less secure by not having a convenient opportunity to get the feedback that I was looking for, or just [to get] questions answered--"What ideas do you have for disciplining this student?"--that kind of thing.

Interestingly, only B-06, among all the participants, links the work experience of prospective mentors with having the time to work with beginners. She says, "I think three or so years of teaching under your belt would be, is, important, so that they have the job down well enough that they've got the time to do these extra things."

The participants cite numerous examples of how the time between beginners and mentors is used, and where it is to be found. In some cases, the time is simply "some time to sit down to talk" (M-07). B-07 reports that it would have been helpful for her to have meetings with her mentor. B-03 also says that beginners and mentors need to meet <u>before</u> the beginning of the semester:

> It might be better if mentors and their mentees got together for a week or two before. I mean, it's almost [as] though you meet each other the day before school starts and they [mentors] are necessarily too busy to take care of you, I understand that.

M-07 also emphasizes that there must be unstructured time for the beginner and mentor to get to know one another before the mentor considers "going into the classroom and observing, because you have to have that relationship."

Another type of time spent by mentors and beginners is planning time. Time for planning can come before the school year or semester begins, when "the mentor and beginning teacher can get together to do such things as figure out how to set up a room" (M-11). Time for planning can also come during the school day when the beginner and mentor plan class activities together, or while the beginner consults the mentor.

In addition to time spent just talking or in planning, the participants often refer to time spent in the classroom of one's partner. For instance, M-07 believes that providing mentors with a chance to meet with and observe beginners is the most critical feature of an effective mentoring program. She says, "I would like to see some formalized time set aside [to meet with a beginner]. I'd also like to have some time to go in the room and actually observe the teacher teaching, which I've never been really given." M-03 points to a mentor's need for time to analyze observation notes and to meet with the beginner in a post-observation conference. "I need another hour to convert those tallies to some type of summary," she notes, "and then probably another hour to talk to her with the things I've

observed." Some participants also emphasize a need for beginners to spend time observing their mentors (e.g., M-03) or, working with their mentor (M-11). B-08 notes that seeing a mentor in actual working situations is valuable for the beginner, but that this visibility also puts the mentor into a vulnerable position:

> The beginning teacher can see this. Some kid belts her [the mentor] one and she rolls with the punches, literally, or the principal chews her out for something, or a parent is irate, and that's where proximity is real important, too, because you can just see those things. Of course, it leaves the mentor teacher wide open for feeling like Zeus on the mountain.

Several participants raise the issue of having or finding the time to make classroom visits, and to engage in related activities, such as post-observation conferences. The problem is usually framed with reference to the provision of release time from regularly assigned duties. M-03 argues that the school system must "provide release time for the mentor teacher and or the beginning teacher both. The state wants the mentor to observe in the classroom, fine. When do you expect us to do it?" However, one participant also suggests that absence from the classroom to observe a beginner, even if a substitute is provided, may not be desirable for all mentors. "My class comes first," M-14 says, "and I was concerned about my class and I hate to have a substitute in there. But there are some times that you have to be out."

The participants describe several different times during and outside of the school day when they meet with their partners. They often mention meeting during shared conference hours or lunch periods. For example, M-03 reports the value of meeting with her beginner during their shared conference hour:

> My beginning teacher and I--it was just an accident, it was not arranged--we did have the same conference hour, which was wonderful, and I've often wondered how we could have done what little we did get done if we didn't have that mutual conference hour.

However, B-03 indicates that meeting with a mentor during a conference hour may not always be a good choice. She points to the importance of that time for the mentor's and beginner's own work:

> It would be nice if they [the administration] could give time, somehow, so mentors could meet with [beginners] off the other's schedule, because you can't expect them to give up their conference hour. So I have found how valuable conference hours can be. That hour a day is the only time to do everything and so I can see that they wouldn't want to give it up.

B-11 also notes that some teachers prefer not to give up any of their time, at least not without an incentive. She says:

> I've found teachers to be very selfish of their time. They don't, as a whole, like to stay after [school] or do more than they have to, so how do you require a mentor to do that

without . . . some sort of small reward?

Several participants mention common lunch periods as another opportunity for mentors and beginners to meet. This time is occasionally described as a desirable to meet, as when M-04 comments that "Rhonda and I have been fortunate [in] that we do share the same lunch period and talk openly about things." B-01, working in a small school, reports that "Our whole staff eats lunch at the same time, so we've got that, which is invaluable for getting anything."

Some participants do not favor lunch as a time for beginners and mentors to meet. In the first place, many participants report that lunch periods are often very brief, sometimes shorter than 20 minutes. More importantly, they suggest that the lunch period is the only time during the day that teachers can relax a little. M-03 comments that lunch was the time that her beginner "got to really relax and forget about school for a brief time," and M-08 says that she and her beginner "did have lunch together, but that's not a good time to discuss anything. Everybody's trying to find a break away from everything." B-03 offers insight into yet another subtle barrier to a beginner's feeling comfortable about meeting with a mentor during a lunch period. She says:

> Lunch hour is only 25 minutes for teachers. You don't have a lot of time but that's the only time I see my mentor and we do talk on lunch hour. . . . We just happen to eat in the same place most of the time, and of course I didn't find that out until the second semester because I ate up here in the work room and then I wandered down to the cafeteria. That's scary for beginners, by the way, to wander into the cafeteria. I mean, you've never been down there and there's this little group that's been together for years, and there you are. So I just went down there and there I was.

Many participants indicate that meeting the various times demands involved in mentoring is related to features of school structure which are largely inflexible. Occasionally they report that some time is <u>made</u> available to them for mentoring activities. For example, M-13 says, "I try to be available at any time, but I would like to have some release time when I could work with this [beginning] teacher. And my experience has been that all I have to do is mention this and I am given that time." Similarly, M-14 indicates that she is provided with time to engage in peer coaching with her beginner:

> When we did our peer coaching we were given a half day and I went in and observed her. Then we had a thirty minute time block that [<u>sic</u>] the two of us conferred. They provided us with that. We did that type of peer coaching two or three times a year.

B-13 describes arrangements being made which allowed her to observe a librarian in another school, both in the library and in the classroom. She says, "I observed her teach four classes, and that was very beneficial. We came away with some ideas for management of a class of students in the library, and some lesson

plan ideas that I thought were good."

Participants describe meeting times for beginners and mentors during the day as occurring much more because of chance than because of intentional arrangement. This is true, for example, with respect to shared conference hours or lunch periods. The participants working in elementary schools point to other times when, by chance, beginners and mentors can be together. For example, M-01 describes meeting with her beginner during recess: "A lot of times we would see each other out on the playground at recess time, 10 or 15 minutes. You'd be out there and you could [ask], 'Well, how's it going? You having any problems?' This sort of thing." Other times that beginners and mentors can get together include those times when specialists in Physical Education, Music, or Art take over classes (e.g., M-05, M-09). A few participants (e.g., B-02, M-09) report that in some schools beginners and mentors are able to meet during 30 minutes before and after the students' school day when teachers are <u>required</u> to be in a school.

In contrast, many participants describe ways in which the structure of schools and of the school day prevents or greatly restricts the time when mentors and beginners can interact. For example, B-14 says, "With her [B-14's beginner] teaching 6th grade and me with Kindergarten, we had absolutely no time, ever. I never saw her during a free time in the building."

Among the participants who work in high schools, structural impediments are frequently cited which prevent beginners and mentors from meeting together. For example, commenting on the trying to arrange beginners' and mentors' work schedules so that they share the same conference hour, M-02 says, "It would be next to impossible to schedule them that way. It's a good idea in theory; in practice it would never work. There's just no way that we could every work it out." B-10 notes that she was unable to meet with her mentor during the day because he taught in an entirely separate building on the school grounds and also because he made home visits during his conference hour. B-11, a Vocational Home Economics teacher, points out the need for her (or her mentor) to go on grocery shopping trips during their conference hour. B-07 reports that her mentor was frequently out of the building in the afternoon, and that various music competitions would often involve her and her mentor after school until as late as eight o'clock at night. M-02 mentions the need to schedule "singleton" classes [i.e., the only section of a course to be offered] as contributing significantly to the problem of assigning beginners and mentors to common conference hours or lunch periods. Finally, B-15 believes that the fact mentor's responsibilities as a department chairperson limited the opportunities for her and her mentor to get together. She says:

> In terms of putting in the extra time, especially, because I think that was a problem in my case. My mentor was department chairman. She had numerous other responsibilities, in addition to being my mentor, and she basically just ran out of time, I think, or ran short on

time.

Participants suggest that beginners and mentors often must scramble to meet with one another because of structural constraints. For example, M-14 reports that most of the time she worked with beginners occurred after school, and M-08 says that her beginner "would come in before school and grab me." B-07 admits that she and her mentor were forced to "catch each other on the run," and B-10 says that she met with her mentor while attending meetings after school when "we were supposed to be doing things besides mentoring."

Proximity.

Closely related to the participants' remarks about time shared between beginners and mentors are their comments about their physical proximity. Some participants do not consider proximity as a critical feature of mentoring programs. B-09 points out, for example, that many elementary schools are so small that the physical distance between mentors and beginners is manageable. M-03 considers other factors, like a personality match between beginner and mentor, as much more important than proximity. B-01 remarks that, except in huge high schools, distance is not a problem. She says, "I think you could take a few extra steps and go out of your way."

By and large, participants view shared time as being more important than proximity. For example, B-09 comments:

> I think if you had those common times, like a lunch hour or a conference hour . . . that would take care of that need [for the beginner to have contact with the mentor]. . . . I don't think you have to be teaching next door to each other to have a successful program.

Location becomes an increasingly important factor as the amount of common time shared by beginner and mentor diminishes, as M-01 notes:

> If you had the time you could meet, the proximity of the rooms wouldn't matter that much. But if you couldn't get a time to meet, then I think being close to each other, where you could maybe see each other either first thing in the morning or last of the day or something like that, would be fine. If you couldn't have the times, then the locations would be good.

However, other participants consider proximity as a relatively important feature of good mentoring programs. B-07 says that the nearness of her mentor in a room directly above her "was the only thing that saved us." M-13 says, "It would be extremely difficult for me to be of any help to someone out on the other wing." In the view of B-03, physical proximity is the most important feature of an effective mentoring program. She notes:

> First, I think . . . he or she [the mentor] should be physically close. My mentor is all the way over there, so he's not been in my room once. Mainly because we're busy and so he doesn't have time to truck around and neither do I, so I haven't seen him much.

Some participants, like M-06, look for a combination of shared time and physical proximity. She says, "It's kind of a combination of [being] given some regular time and being close by . . . that accessibility to get to you when you have a problem."

In general, many participants emphasize the importance of proximity for the beginner in getting quick answers to questions and ready advice for dealing with pressing classroom situations. "There are lots of times [while] teaching [in] elementary school, where things come up [at the] last minute and you need an answer immediately, right now," observes B-06. M-07 believes that such immediate accessibility is very important. She comments:

> There just needs to be somebody who's going to be around where they can grab that person and say, "Hey, by the way, such and such happened. What can I do? What should I have done? Is there something I can change quickly now before my decision is set in cement?" . . . They really need somebody close by, somebody within hands' reach that they can grab for.

M-03 points out that even a short delay of thirty minutes in providing the beginner with information or advice can be costly. Similarly, M-06 notes that immediate assistance is often crucial:

> Whether it would be [in] teaching or counseling . . . your mentor would be someone who was close by . . . so that when you have problems you don't have to wait 'til the next day, that you can get some help and assistance immediately. Because in a classroom situation so often times you need, if Johnny's misbehaving and [you ask] "What can I do about it? What's worked?"--it's not going to help if it's two days down the road.

M-12 and B-11 suggest that locating beginners near mentors is important for yet another reason. M-12 predicts that the concern for safety in the classrooms of some schools requires that beginners be located very near to their mentors in order to minimize the time that they spend out of their classrooms. B-11 makes a similar case for schools in which classroom discipline may be a great concern.

Among the participants, only M-10 and M-03 suggest that there may be a <u>disadvantage</u> in locating beginners very near to their mentors. In such a situation, M-10 observes that the beginner and the mentor "could get on each other's nerves, like husband and wife. At each other's throat." On the other hand, M-03 says that beginners may feel uncomfortable and under scrutiny if their classrooms are located very near to their mentors' classrooms. She says:

> You want to give her [the beginner] some space. . . . You don't want her to feel like that mentor is watching every move she makes. She's got to have a little freedom of her own. . . . I could see where they wouldn't want to feel like they were being watched every single second, or that we hear through the walls, or to think, "Every time my class gets a little loud, they're hearing it."

As with the feature of shared time, participants stress that

the physical proximity of beginner and mentor is related to the physical structure and organization of schools. Participants working in elementary schools point out that classroom locations are generally determined by grade. As M-08 suggests, significant differences in the grade taught by the beginner and the grade taught by the mentor can also affect their proximity to one another. She says, "I hardly ever see the upper grade people because they're at the other end of the building. Had she [M-08's beginner] been an upper grade person . . . our schedules would not ever have crossed one another." (M-04, separated from her beginner by a flight of stairs, reports that she sometimes communicates with her beginner by means of notes carried by a student who moves between the two classrooms for accelerated work.) M-14 also admits that "moving" classrooms so that a beginner and a mentor might be near one another is a difficult task and "no small process" because of "the tons of little bitty things you have to move." Likewise, participants working in secondary schools indicate that the classroom location of teachers is typically based on department or content area. However, this is not always the case, since M-02 points out that the department of which she is a member is located in two different sections of the school building that are separated from each other by a considerable distance.

Some participants report situations in which mentors and beginners are actually isolated from one another. B-10, for example, notes that her mentor is located in a different building. B-2 and B-13, both school librarians, point out that an experienced elementary school librarian who serves as a mentor for a beginning elementary school librarian will usually work in a different school. The situation is even more drastic for M-06, a school counselor. She is assigned to two schools, and her beginner is assigned to three <u>different</u> schools. In these situations, direct contact between beginner and mentor is reported to be very minimal, and most of the contact that does exist is by means of school mail, telephone, or (in the case of B-13) electronic mail.

<u>Actual Practices of Selection and Matching</u>

Despite the possible importance of the factors described above that can be used in selecting prospective mentors and matching them with beginners--gender, age, experience, teaching philosophy, personality, content-area or grade-level, and accessibility--there are other factors that are largely absent from what participants talk about, at least in any very direct fashion. Most notably, with some exceptions they mention little about the instructional expertise of prospective mentors. One exception is found in M-03. She stresses that the instructional ability of a prospective mentor should be an important consideration in the selection process. She says, "We've got to match these people with strong classroom teachers." M-05 emphasizes instructional expertise in the mentor by viewing mentoring as a way to prevent the beginner from "reinventing the wheel." She observes:

> Another area that I really encourage people, teachers, in is don't try to reinvent the wheel. You know, teachers are sitting in their classrooms every year trying to figure out things. If they just get out and talk to people, they were figured out a long, long time ago. And we keep trying to go back and I keep telling them, "Don't wonder about how to teach that division problem. Get out and ask five or six of your colleagues how they teach division. Somebody will tell you how to do it, if you mentor or your buddy teacher can do it."

Other participants indirectly imply that instructional expertise is important in a mentor. M-14 argues strongly that mentors "should be well versed on the latest trends in education and should have tried those. And even in the assessment and evaluation of teachers." M-02 mentions that "a brand new teacher needs somebody to discuss techniques with," and M-11 emphasizes that mentors need to see themselves as demonstrating different ways of teaching to the beginners with whom they work. B-13 includes "exposure to different learning styles, different lesson plans" from the mentor as a primary benefit of a mentoring program for the beginner.

As with instructional expertise, relatively little mention is made of the need for a mentor to be an expert in terms of curriculum, except for M-09, who argues that in teaching "what we teach the children to me is the most important" and that a mentor ought to be skilled in this regard. More typically, the mentor is described as someone to whom a beginner can turn for advice on such things as "how they want the academics presented" (M-09) and "textbook things and . . . student ability at that level" (B-12). M-06 voices a typical sentiment held by participants when she describes the mentor as someone a beginner can turn to when "talking curriculum ideas."

The participants suggest that selection of mentors and pairing them with beginners is often a very informal process and a function of very different considerations than any of those mentioned above, with the exception of common content area or grade. (One notable exception to this line of thinking is M-14, someone who served as a mentor in a state in which mentoring programs were highly organized. For her, the careful and rigorous selection of mentors is the most important feature of effective mentoring programs.) At one extreme, M-02, a high school teacher, suggests that mentoring responsibilities may automatically be assigned to department chairpersons--regardless of any other considerations--as the beginner is told, "'Here is your Department Head. If you have any questions, you go to your Department Head'" (M-02). At the other extreme, an important consideration in selecting a teacher to be a mentor may just be the willingness of that teacher to serve as a mentor. As B-04 says, "Certainly I would think that one of the criteria [should] be that they [prospective mentors] wanted to do it as opposed to a principal telling them that they needed to do that." However, many participants also are very quick to point out that the

teachers most likely to volunteer to serve as mentors are the same teachers who are involved in many other professional responsibilities above and beyond their work assignment. M-03 voices this opinion:

> You've got to keep in mind that especially in your smaller [school] systems, the person who's willing to be a mentor is probably also a person who is willing to serve on the curriculum committee, who is probably willing to have tutoring sessions one day per week after school for their advanced students, who is maybe the head of their department or who is an officer in the local teacher's organization.

It appears that a willingness to serve as a mentors--professional volunteerism--is what drives the selection of mentors in many schools. Structural factors limit the pool of prospective mentors, including the small proportion of male teachers in elementary schools and the limited number of classes for each grade in elementary schools, the schedule of middle and high school teachers, often fixed in advance and independent of its relationship to the needs of beginning teacher/mentor pairs, the physical arrangements of schools, the problem of determining beginning teachers' "philosophy of teaching" in advance and the fluidity of their philosophy. The last-minute selection and assignment of beginning teachers, often after the school year begins, makes even more clear the likelihood that the selection of mentors and the pairing of them with beginning teachers is seldom implemented as suggested in the literature on mentoring.

Conclusion

Throughout their interviews, most of the 15 beginners and 14 mentors who participated in this study clearly communicate how greatly they value effective mentoring programs for beginning teachers, school librarians, and school counselor. It is also clear that the participants perceive that the greatest obstacles to effective mentoring programs often lie within the structure and organization of school, especially in terms of how easily beginners and mentors can spend time together, in conversation or in each other's working environment.

For the majority of participants, a formal mentoring program is a relatively new idea, and their ideas about it are just beginning to take shape. The interviews present many indications that these beginners and mentors are part of mentoring programs in very early stages of development. Based largely on their own experiences and intuitions rather than on formal training in mentoring or other sources of information, the participants suggest that several of the possible factors used in selecting experienced teachers to serve as mentors--age, gender, years of experience, and shared philosophy of teaching--are relatively unimportant and unrelated to their notion of effective mentoring relationships. At the same time, they strongly believe that the successful match between mentor and beginner is related to their work assignment and to the opportunity for them to spend time together.

References

Bey, T. M., and Holmes, C. T. (Eds.). (1990). Mentoring: Developing successful new teachers. Reston, Virginia: Association of Teacher Educators.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie.

The Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, Inc.

Howey, K. R., & Zimpher, N. L. (1988). The role of higher education in initial year of teaching programs. In G. A. Griffin & S. Millies (Eds.), The first years of teaching: Background papers and a proposal (pp. 35-64). Chicago: Illinois State Board of Education.

Huling-Austin, L. (1990). Teacher induction programs and internships. In W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.). Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 535-548). New York: Macmillan.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Lofland, J. & Lofland, L. H. (1984). Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis. (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1985). NCATE Redesign. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Seidel, J. V., Kjolseth, R., & Seymour, E. (1988, March). The ethnograph. [computer program]. Littleton, CO: Qualis Research.

Sikula, J. (1986). Visions of reform: Implications for the education profession. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Table 1

School District Characteristics

	Characteristics					
District	Enrollment	Ele	JrHi	Hi	Teaching Staff	Average Salary[1]
Harrison	20,000-25,000	40-50	6-10	6-10	1,000-1,500	$28,000
Pierce	1,000-2,000	1-5	1-5	1-5	100-200	$25,000
Fillmore	< 1,000	1-5	0	1-5	< 50	$20,000

[1] Instructors, certified staff, and administrators

Table 2

Response rates of potential study participants

	Mentors				Beginners			
District	Total contacted	Yes	No	No Response	Total contacted	Yes	No	No Response
Harrison	54	11	22	21	64	12	12	40
Pierce	3	1	1	1	3	1	0	2
Fillmore	4	2	1	1	4	2	0	2

Table 3

Mentors--Selected Characteristics

	Characteristics					
Mentor	Sex[1]	Race[2]	Age range	School level	Teaching experience (in years)	School district
M-01	F	Wh	46-55	Ele	16-20	Fillmore
M-02	F	Wh	26-35	Sec	1-5	Harrison
M-03	F	Wh	26-35	Sec	11-15	Pierce
M-04	F	Wh	> 56	Ele	26-30	Harrison
M-05	F	Wh	46-55	Ele	31-35	Harrison
M-06	F	Wh	36-45	Ele Counselor	11-15	Harrison
M-07	F	Wh	36-45	Ele	21-25	Harrison
M-08	F	Wh	36-45	Ele	16-20	Harrison
M-09	F	Wh	46-55	Ele	11-15	Harrison
M-10	M	Wh	> 56	Sec	36-40	Fillmore
M-11	F	Wh	46-55	Ele	11-15	Harrison
M-12	F	Wh	36-45	Ele	16-20	Harrison
M-13	F	Wh	36-45	Ele	16-20	Harrison
M-14	F	Wh	36-45	Ele	21-25	Harrison

[1] F = Female M = Male [2] Wh = White

Table 4

Beginners--Selected Characteristics

	Characteristics					
Beginner	Sex[1]	Race[2]	Age range	School level	Teaching experience (in years)	School district
B-01	F	Wh	< 26	Sec	1-5	Harrison
B-02	F	Wh	36-45	Ele librarian	0	Pierce
B-03	F	Wh	36-45	Sec	0	Harrison
B-04	F	Wh	46-55	Ele	0	Harrison
B-05	F	As	36-45	Sec	6-10	Harrison
B-06	F	Wh	36-45	Ele	unknown	Harrison
B-07	F	Wh	26-35	Sec	0	Harrison
B-08	F	Wh	36-45	Jr Hi	0	Harrison
B-09	F	Wh	36-45	Ele	1-5	Harrison
B-10	F	Wh	26-35	Sec	0	Fillmore
B-11	F	Wh	26-35	Sec	1-5	Harrison
B-12	F	Wh	26-35	Ele	0	Harrison
B-13	F	Wh	36-45	Ele Librarian	0	Harrison
B-14	F	Wh	46-55	Ele	0	Fillmore
B-15	F	Wh	36-45	Sec	0	Harrison

[1] F = Female [2] Wh = White As = Asian

Table 5

Summary of Participant Characteristics

	Mentors	Beginners	Combined
Sex			
Female	13	15	28
Male	1	0	1
Race			
White	14	14	28
Asian	0	1	1
Age range			
< 26	0	1	1
26-35	2	4	6
36-45	6	8	14
46-55	4	2	6
> 56	2	0	2
School level			
Elementary	11	7	18
Junior Hi	0	1	1
Secondary	3	7	10

Table 5 (continued)

Summary of Participant Characteristics

	Mentors	Beginners	Combined
Teaching experience (in years)			
0	0	10	10
1-5	1	3	4
6-10	0	1	1
11-15	4	0	4
16-20	4	0	4
21-25	2	0	2
26-30	1	0	1
31-35	1	0	1
36-40	1	0	1
Cannot be determined	0	1	1
School district			
Harrison	11	12	23
Pierce	1	1	2
Fillmore	2	2	4